IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.THANKAPPAN

THURSDAY, THE 26TH OCTOBER 2006 / 4TH KARTHIKA 1928

RP.No. 920 of 2006()

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.1902/2005 Dated 20/09/2005

.....

PETITIONER/7TH RESPONDENT IN THE WPC:

A.M.THOBIAS,
II GRADE OVERSEER (ELECTRICAL),
ELECTRICAL WING SUB DIVISION, PALAKKAD.

BY ADV. SRI.B.C.HARISANKAR

RESPONDENTS: PETITIONERS 1 & 2 & RESPONDENTS 1TO 6 & 8 TO 10 IN WPC.

---

1. A.R.KUTTYKRISHNAN,
LINEMAN GRADE I, PWD ELECTRICAL SECTION,
MEDICAL COLLEGE, KOZHIKODE.

2. ABDUL RAZAK K.,
LINEMAN GRADE I, PWD ELECTRICAL SECTION,
MEDICAL COLLEGE, KOZHIKODE.

3. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY ITS
SECRETARY, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

4. CHIEF ENGINEER,
PWD ADMINISTRATION, TRIVANDRUM.

5. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
ELECTRICAL WING, (PWD), KOZHIKODE.

6. P.SASIDHARAN,
II GRADE OVERSEER (ELECTRICAL),
PWD WING DIVISION, THODUPUZHA.

7. N.BHASKARAN,
II GRADE OVERSEER (ELECTRICAL),
PWD ELECTRICAL DIVISION, KOZHIKODE.

8. A.ASOKAN,
II GRADE OVERSEER (ELECTRICAL),

PWD ELECTRICAL WING WEST SECTION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

9. A.RAGHAVAN,
II GRADE OVERSEER (ELECTRICAL),
PWD ELECTRICAL SECTION, KANNUR.

10. M.D.ASOK,
II GRADE OVERSEER (ELECTRICAL),
PWD ELECTRICAL WEST SECTION, TIRUVALLA.

11. V.BABU,
II GRADE OVERSEER (ELECTRICAL),
PWD ELECTRICAL DIVISION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADVS. SRI.P.SANKARANKUTTY NAIR
SRI.T.V.AJAYAKUMAR
SRI.SANDESH RAJ
SRI.T.G.RAJENDRAN
SRI.P.SREEKUMAR
GOVT.PLEADER SRI. THOMAS JOHN AMBOOKKAN-R3 TO R5

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 26/10/2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K.THANKAPPAN, J.

R.P. NO. 920 OF 2006
IN
W.P.(C)NO.1902 OF 2005

Dated this the 24th day of November, 2006

O R D E R

This Review Petition is filed against the judgment dated 20.9.2006 in W.P.(C)No.1902 of 2005. By the impugned judgment, this Court found that the petitioners in the above Writ Petition were entitled for promotion to the post of Overseer/Draftsman Grade II and directed respondents 2 and 3 therein to take up the case of the petitioners and to effect promotions as per law.

7. The review petitioner is the 7th respondent in the Writ Petition. The specific case set up by the review petitioner is that he was not heard and that he is also entitled for promotion. According to the petitioners, they already acquired the required test qualification and that without considering the priority in test qualification, some of their juniors were promoted by the authorities. Hence, the Writ Petition was allowed with the above direction to respondents 2 and 3. If the review petitioner was qualified to be promoted, his case would have been considered by the authorities. Further, the review petitioner has no case that he acquired the

test qualification prior to the petitioners in the Writ Petition.

Hence, the Review Petition is without merit and it is accordingly dismissed.

(K.THANKAPPAN, JUDGE)

sp/